

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/663,672	09/17/2003	Masanori Hashiba	OGW-0285 2466		
23353	23353 7590 12/01/2004		EXAM	EXAMINER	
	RADER FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC LION BUILDING			DIXON, MERRICK L	
1233 20TH STREET N.W., SUITE 501			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
WASHINGT	ON, DC 20036		1774		

DATE MAILED: 12/01/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/663,672	HASHIBA ET AL.				
		Examiner	Art Unit				
		Merrick Dixon	1774				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app r Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the d	correspondence address				
A SHO THE N - Exten after 5 - If the - If NO - Failur Any re	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL'MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. sions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1: SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period to treply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute eply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing d patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tir y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed /s will be considered timely. I the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 D	ecember 2003.					
	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.						
3)□	·						
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition	on of Claims						
4)⊠	4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-9</u> is/are pending in the application.						
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
	☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. ☐ Claim(s) <u>1-9</u> is/are rejected. ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
•							
_							
Application	on Papers						
	The specification is objected to by the Examine	r					
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.							
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.45(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
•	•	naionitu undon 25 I I C O C 440(a)	(d) = = (D)				
a)[∑	 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). 						
* Se	* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
		·	Mula				
Attachment(s)		MERRICK DIXON				
1) Notice	of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413 PRIMARY EXAMINER				
3) 🔯 Inform	of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) ation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) No(s)/Mail Date <u>see office action</u> .	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	atent Application (PTO-152)				

Art Unit: 1774

15

The instant office action contains two(2) initialed and signed PTO-1449:

PTO-1449 has date of 9-17-2003

PTO-1449 has date of 12-16-2003.

16

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1, line 2, the phrase, "apparent density" is not understood. Applicants are requested to provide better claim language for examination. Also, what material is this referring to? The examiner hereinafter assigns this density to the fiberboard.

In claim 2, the phrase, "the carboxyl-terminal" lacks proper antecedent basis. In line 2, of claim 2, the weight lacks recognizable units.

In claim 5, it is not understood what bending strength is being referred to.

In claim 6, the claim is not understood. The "retention rate of a bending strength" is not understood. No rate is claimed. What bending strength is being referred to here?

Applicants are requested to provide better claim language for examination.

Art Unit: 1774

17

Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 8, line 3, it is not understood what the phrase, "through melt spinning" refers to.

In claim 9, it is not understood if the polyactic acid resin are new or portions remaining after the fibrosing step in claim 8. Isn't the resin now totally fibers? Is the fibers further fibrosed?

18

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

19

Claims 1,2, 4-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andersen et al(5830548) alone.

The cited reference teaches the basic claimed invention including a fiberboard material of specific density made from mixture of natural fibers and polylactic acid resin- col 1,

Art Unit: 1774

lines 50-56; col 8, lines 10-21; col 10, lines 23-65; col 11, lines 39-54; col 19, lines 10-32; col 28, lines 48-64. The reference teaches the claimed density in col 90, lines 17-20. It is submitted the cited reference teaches the claimed invention, as set forth above and can be understood. Concerning claim 5 and 6, the reference teaches fiberboard inherent strengths, including bending strength, resulting from fiber inclusions/properties in col 14, lines 33-35; col 42, lines 28-43. Obtaining optimum values for such result effective variable involves routine skill in the art. In re Boesch, 617 F.2d 272,205, USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980). Concerning claims 4 and 7, it is submitted that the resin would possess such claimed article limitations as such would be inherent. Likewise and concerning claim 2, it would involve only routine skill in the art to obtain the claimed equivalent weight for the carboxyl-terminal. In re Boesch, 617 F.2d 272,205 USPQ 215 (CCPA).

20

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andersen et al(US 5,830,548) in view of Papsin Jr(US 6,281,298).

The primary reference teaches the claimed invention as set forth above, inter alla. The reference fails to teach polycarbodiimide additive in its fiberboard article. The secondary reference, however, teaches that it is known in the art to add such well known adhesive enhancer such as polycarbodiimide compound in mixtures for making fiberboards as taught by the primary reference- col 9, lines 49-61; col 13, lines 20-26. it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention is made to

Art Unit: 1774

combine the teachings of the secondary reference and include such well known adhesive enhancer such as polycarbodiimide compound in the primary reference's mixture, in the absence of unexpected results. Such a combination would have been obvious to better bond/form the fiberboard- see Papsin jr, col 9, lines 52-57.

21

Claim 9 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

22

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Reck et al(US 6,596,386 B1) is cited of interest for its teachings as set forth and additionally to show the state of the art.

23

Applicants who wish to send a facsimile (draft copies) for the examiner's immediate review can do so by using the Examiner's personal fax number at 571-273-1520. The faxing of all papers must conform with the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 O.G. 30 (November 15, 1989). NOTE: All facsimiles sent to the examiner's personal fax number should be in draft-forms and will be treated as informal.

Art Unit: 1774

Same facsimiles will not be entered in the related applications unless

Page 6

otherwise agreed and noted by the examiner.

The fax number for all other fascimile is 703-872-9306.

Information about the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Information Retrieval system (Private PAIR).

Status inquires for published applications may be retrieved from either Private PAIR

or Public PAIR. Questions about the PAIR system should be directed to the Electronic

Business Center at 866-217-9197.

Any questions concerning the instant communication should be directed to Examiner

Dixon, at 571-272-1520, Mondays to Thursdays, between 12 noon and 8 PM, eastern

time . The examiner's supervisor, Mrs. Rena Dye, can be reached at 571-272-3186.

Merrick Dixon

Primary Examiner

Group 1700